

REMARKS

This paper is submitted in response to the final Office action mailed on November 24, 2010.

By this paper, claims 28, 29, 31 and 32 have been amended and claims 30 and 33 have been canceled. Claims 27 and 34 were previously canceled. Therefore, claims 1-26, 28-29 and 31-32 are presently pending.

I. Examiner Interview

The Examiner interview conducted between Bridget Hayden and Examiner Purol on January 10, 2011 is appreciated. During the interview, the § 251 and 112, first paragraph rejections were discussed. While no formal agreement was reached, it is believed that upon submission of this paper and a supplemental declaration that all outstanding issues will be resolved and that the claims are in a condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact Bridget Hayden at (612) 492-6867 to discuss items that will move this case towards allowance.

II. Supplemental Oath/Declaration

Claims 1-26 and 28-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 251 based on a defective reissue oath/declaration. A supplemental Declaration is provided herewith.

III. Claim Objections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 28-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph for allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner generally alleges the claims contain subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to those skilled in the art that the inventors had possession of the claimed invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed, at least for the reasons provided in the response of 9 August 2010, which are reasserted, but not reproduced herein.

However, notwithstanding the impropriety of the § 112, first paragraph rejection, in order to advance prosecution, claims 28, 29, 31 and 32 have been amended and claims 30 and 33 have been canceled.

With respect to amended claim 28, applicant has amended the claim to delete the subject matter relating to the vertical spacing between the engaging collars being a dimension of an integer value equal to a vertical spacing between cross-rungs, and the claim now recites that the venetian blind comprises "a plurality of engaging collars that are slidably mounted about

said auxiliary tilt cord and said first vertical member between each adjacent pair of cross-rungs of said first vertical member.” The claim language of amended claim 28 is supported by the specification at least at column 10, line 65 to column 11, line 13.

With respect to amended claim 29, which depends from claim 28, applicant has amended the claim to delete the subject matter relating to the spacing of the beads being an integer value of a dimension slightly less than vertical spacing between cross-rungs, the claim now recites that the venetian blind comprises “a plurality of beads that are spaced along said auxiliary tilt cord, each of the plurality of beads associated with one of the plurality of engaging collars.” The claim language of amended claim 29 is supported by the specification at least at column 10, line 65 to column 11, line 13.

With respect to claim 31, applicant has amended the claim to delete the subject matter relating to the vertical spacing between the engaging collars being a dimension of an integer value equal to a vertical spacing between cross-rungs, and the claim now recites that the venetian blind comprises “a plurality of engaging collars that are slidably mounted about said auxiliary tilt cord and said first vertical member between selected pairs of cross-rungs of said first vertical member.” The claim language of amended claim 31 is supported by the specification at least at column 10, line 65 to column 11, line 13.

With respect to claim 32, which depends from claim 31, applicant has amended the claim to delete the subject matter relating to the spacing of the beads being an integer value of a dimension slightly less than vertical spacing between cross-rungs, and the claim now recites that the venetian blind comprises “a plurality of beads that are spaced along said auxiliary tilt cord, each of the plurality of beads associated with one of the plurality of engaging collars.” The claim language of amended claim 32 is supported by the specification at least at column 10, line 65 to column 11, line 13.

IV. Conclusion


The Applicant thanks the Examiner for thoroughly reviewing the application. The Applicant respectfully submits the present reissue application, as amended, is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests the issuance of a Notice of Allowability as soon as practicable.

A Request for Continued Examination accompanies this Amendment and Response. Accordingly, please charge Deposit Account number 04-1415 in the amount of \$810.00 for the Request for Continued Examination fee. The Assignee believes no further fees or petitions are required. However, should any such fees or petitions be required, please consider this as authorization therefor and please charge such fees to Deposit Account number 04-1415.

If the Examiner should require any additional information or amendment, please contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 23 day of February 2011.

Respectfully submitted,



Lee R. Osman, Reg. No. 38,260
DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
1400 Wewatta Street, Suite 400
Denver, Colorado 80202
Tel: (303) 629-3400
Fax: (303) 629-3450

USPTO Customer No. 20686